18 October 1949

OF K

Michaelin Ity

MEMORANDUM FOR: MR. CHILDS

SUBJECT:

Comments on Draft of Proposed Memorandum from the DCI to the MSC Prepared by the

Office of Counsel

1. To my mind the proposed memo contains the sum of the deficiencies which were inherent in previous drafts prepared by some of the Offices of CIA, namely, it does not sufficiently protect the Director. We must fully recognize that such a step as he might take in sending a paper of this type to the MSC is really inviting a "head-rolling" contest, and that he must be in a unique position of solidarity on every word expressed by him if he takes such initiative. Thus, when the attached memorandum uses such words as "refusal" on the part of the agencies to give certain material, and "blocks" which the agencies are placing in the way of CIA fulfilling its designated mission we are lodging very serious indictments against powerful and long-established executive departments and agencies of the Government, the heads of which comprise to some degree the judicial body before whom the Director places his case, i.e., the National Security Council.

2. I believe we are on very weak grounds in criticizing the "IAC mechanism." The so-called "mechanism" for the Intelligence Advisory Committee is the procedure which we have endersed and followed in the last few years and is not that prescribed by MSCID No. 1. In commenting on the Dulles Report, the National Security Council concurred in the observation and conclusion that the IAC was conceived soundly "as an advisory body." Nowhere in MSCID No. 1, which created the lac, is the thought expressed that the IAC should be other than advisory in scope. Furthermore, MSCID No. 1 does not call for unanimity when the Director uses the IAC to test out the "advice and recommendations" which he may send to the National Security Council. In fact, MSCID No. 1 not only recognizes, but is sympathetic toward the view that in using the IAC the Birector will not find unanimity, but rather the expression of individual agency viewpoints which will be looked upon as "non-concurrences." Hence, instead of asking for a

revision of MSCID No. 1 to overcome the "board of directors" philosophy, which has controlled so much of the deliberations of the IAC, what we really need to do is to suggest that the Director take a definite stand when papers are submitted to the Matienal Security Council for decision. It is probable that the stand of the DCI will, in practically all instances, parallel that of the majority opinion. However, even that is not obligatory and it is quite conceivable that the occasion, or occasions, may arise when the BCI in transmitting a paper to the NSC may concur in the minority viewpoint. We must also recognize that by the adoption of this procedure, which is called for in MSCID No. 1, the BCI may adopt a viewpoint which differs materially from any of the advisory concepts expressed by the members of the IAC.

3. By statements are not to be misinterpreted as saying that the National Security Council Intelligence Directives, as written, do not need revemping. By apprehension is on the point of contending that the revision of MSCID No. 1 will overcome the difficulties experienced today in our IAC dealings.

Machan

25X1A